



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0954FL-2 for District School Board of Pasco County

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The Project provided some background information on the district and included the goals and objectives for education students, which were measurable. The grant discussed the district's plan for personalizing the learning environment, which was unclear and very broad. The grant shared the performance data from the FCAT 2.0 and PARCC assessments. Their vision statement is to "create a community which works together so all Pasco County students will reach their highest potential" which is clear. The proposal continues and presents what they call a "shared vision" which states "we commit to providing a world-class education for all students, using five guiding principles to shape and fashion our actions" and is not similar to their original. It is unclear as to which one is the "correct" vision for the district. The next couple of paragraphs are focused on the five guiding principles, which are: continuous learning, continuity of care, equity, excellence and innovation and described in the grant with some details. The focus is on the students and staff. The grant discusses Pasco's reform vision which "for PLE's requires a substantial shift in the role of teacher and the requisite professional development and support for ongoing coaching ensuring instructional best practices." The grant describes a vision and it is clear and relates to the four core educational assurance areas.</i></p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The applicant included the background data and test results from the assessments. They did not indicate whether all schools will be involved nor did the grant present selection criteria on the buildings that will be selected. The grant did include the number of students and it was unclear whether the 5 charter schools will be involved. It was not clearly indicated in the grant.</i></p> <p><i>A number of statements are included in this section of the grant that discusses the reform vision it is unclear and lacks any specificity on the implementation of the reform proposal. One of the statements is as follows: "Additionally, students are afforded the opportunity to extend learning to exceed expected outcomes and connect learning to related areas of interest to create deeper learning opportunities. Structures are in place for students to access information and learning opportunities by utilizing technology to extend beyond the walls of the school; opportunities for interactions with students from diverse communities, cultures, races, and creeds; this combination of technology and community will represent the new learning environment." The structure in the system are not explained not are the opportunities to use technology. The process for the interaction of students from divers communities is very broad and does not include specifics for the implementation of this outcome. The last statement on combining the technology and community to represent the new learning is not explained in this section. The steps for accomplishing this outcome are not presented in this section.</i></p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The plan is delineated in the grant but lacks much specificity and details. The strategies and activities related to making the "change" is somewhat unclear and broad. They grant mentions a "world class education" yet provides some details in what and how this will be implemented in the district.</i></p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>There are very specific goals listed in the grant and a solid management plan in the appendix with specific roles. The grant itself does not discuss the strategies for reaching these outcomes. While most of the goals are measurable, it appears that</i></p>		

some were not discussed in the grant and maybe difficult to achieve based on the content of grant

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	8
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The school district received a Title I School Improvement Grant for a three-year period. The purpose was to provide additional resources to Ridgewood High School with the goal of substantially improving the quality of instruction and student achievement outcomes at the</i></p> <p><i>School. Teachers were also provided with a performance pay component that was determined by the success of their students on standardized assessments. The graduation rate in Pasco has climbed steadily, from 67.8% to 85.5%. Pasco's students showed steady gains in AP, with an increase of 6% of students scoring a level 3 or higher. These results are very positive but additional outcomes and achievement data would have been very helpful.</i></p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The district will make the data public by placing it on their website and some public forums. While making the budgeting process transparent it would also be of benefit to the district if there were parental involvement in the instructional side. The involvement of the community in developing/modifying the districts curriculum program demonstrates a commitment to parents to make sure the students receive exactly what the School District of Pasco County identified in their vision statement. It also allows for parents to view and become involved in the education of their child(ren). Businesses can provide input on future directions and the "type" of student who will fill jobs in the future. This demonstrates that the school district is interested in the input from the community at large. The district will make the data public by placing it on their website and some public forums. While making the budgeting process transparent it would also be of benefit to the district if there were parental involvement in the instructional side. The involvement of the community in developing/modifying the districts curriculum program demonstrates a commitment to parents to make sure the students receive exactly what the School District of Pasco County identified in their vision statement. It also allows for parents to view and become involved in the education of their child(ren). Businesses can provide input on future directions and the "type" of student who will fill jobs in the future. This demonstrates that the school district is interested in input from the community at large.</i></p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The applicant described a solid plan for personalizing education through the Achievement Via Individual Determination (AVID) course, which is approved by the Florida State Course Directory. The AVID course is targeted for students in the academic middle who are members of underrepresented subgroups or those who would be the first in their family to attend a post secondary school. The College Board Advanced Placement (AP) curriculum is mandated by the state through Florida Statute 1007.27. All students at the high school level must have access to each of the four core curriculum AP course threads. Each of Pasco County's high schools meets this requirement, which allows for students to experience rigorous, college-level coursework. Pasco County students are also given the opportunity to enroll into the International Baccalaureate Diploma program (IB). There is a state supported Dual Enrollment program and a virtual program. The grant provided specifics related to each program but failed to mention how all of these are tied together and correlated to the district curriculum outcomes.</i></p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The grant provides the number of volunteers but otherwise presents minimal information on the meaningful stakeholders.</i></p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The applicant list tools and resources for the transition but these are very general and do not provide specifics.</i></p>		

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The grant discussed approaches and strategies for implementing personalized learning environment and uses terms such as robust, increase, develop, utilize and other general terms. It is difficult to determine specifically what will be implemented as a PLE. Pasco's Personalized Learning Environment (PPLE) will engage and empower all learners through a database system to develop, plan and monitor goals and progression toward mastery of those goals. The idea that students will be co-creators of their educational plan is very solid.</i></p> <p>The student will have clear expectations of targeted success based on the present levels of performance and other indicators. Additionally, students can exceed expected outcomes and connect learning to related areas of interest to create deeper learning opportunities. How this will be implemented is unclear. Students are also assigned a guidance counselor and a learning coach to identify academic strengths, learning styles, interests and supports needed for the student to be successful. There is also the mention of technology but it is a very brief paragraph at the end of this section. The details on professional development and implementation are presented in the proposal and could be more specific.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	13
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The professional development will focus on knowledge of practice, importance of implementation and reflection and use of inquiry to evaluate and continuously improve. The grant indicated that there will be a Professional Development Coach at each school site with an explicit focus on designing, delivering, supporting, and evaluating professional development. Teachers will cycle through a model of professional development with the end result being knowledge of practice or teacher research focused on the needs of their individual students. The grant did not state how the professional development program will be implemented in the schools and district and how this will help student.</p>		

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	9
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>There is a cross-functional leadership team, which will be expanded to include the content and program experts needed to support the additional goals of the Grant. The grant did describe a plan but details were not included for a clearer understanding of the steps to implement this in the district.</i></p> <p><i>The Pasco Local Instructional Improvement System (LIIS) will support personalized learning by providing a portal for all stakeholders, including students, teachers, parents, and school and district administrators. This will allow for access to data and resources to inform decision-making related to instruction, assessment, and career and college goals. While there is increased access to data, the grant did not include comments related to mastery of content in the "regular" classroom program but did mention opportunities for choices - Florida Virtual School, APEX and Pasco eSchool. There is no description on achieving mastery for the students who do not participate in the on-line program.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, Ridgewood High School will add 20 minutes of instructional time for "Critical Thinking and Study Skills" however, there is no mention on why these two topics are being added and there is no research to support this change. By the final year of the grant, Ridgewood High School has increased their instructional time by adding 50-minute class period to the school day, which resulted in adding a total of 150 hours to the school year but did not include data to support this change in the instructional changes in the school building. The grant states that "The teacher portal will allow educators to supplement their standard instruction with individualized instructional materials; access detailed diagnostic breakdown of each student's performance including areas of need; and participate in professional development modules according to personal interests, district goals, and state standards." This sentence is not explained with any detail on how it will be accomplished.</i></p>		

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The grant did include a high quality plan that will provide services, resources and support to all of the students and staff. The grant did indicate that (a) parents, and school and district administrators will have access to data and resources to inform decision-making related to instruction, assessment, and career and college goals. There was no mention of (b) students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders having appropriate levels of technical support. The grant did indicate that the (c) data and information resources will be exportable in standard formats as appropriate for use in downloading into spreadsheets or other software products for manipulation as needed.</i></p> <p><i>(d) It was unclear what data and information resources will be exportable and what and who will provide the training and technical support. Interoperability standards will be included in the specifications of the Local Instructional Improvement System (LIIS) to meet the IMS Global Learning interoperability standards including QTI - Question and test interoperability; APIP - Accessible Portable Item Profile - CCSS specs; LTI - Learning Tools Interoperability and Common Cartridge. There is little explanation of the infrastructure and how it will support personalized learning. There was technical support for students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders.</i></p>		

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	7
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Professional development will be evaluated using the Florida Professional Development Protocol. The district will also hire outside evaluators to ensure compliance with all grant management practices. No mention is made of any course corrections or how issues/concerns will be dealt with as a part of this grant.</p> <p>The grant does not discuss continuous improvement with any details. The grant does represent and provide targets for increased student achievement. The grant does not mention comments on what will happen if the goal or student outcome is not achieved. It is also very concerning while the charts indicate the level of mastery there is no discussion on the rest of the students who have not reached mastery and what effort will the school district put forth to work with the students that did not master the content. Most of the levels of mastery were increased by 2-6 percentage points over a five-year period. This demonstrates minimal growth.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	0
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Not discussed in grant.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has included some often measures but it is difficult to determine the numbers and percentages.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The grant provides the same list of outcomes as in the first section and lists the performance measures. There is no explanation included in the grant.</p>		

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The grant included all of the key elements for this budget with costs that are described and explained with good supporting details. The budget is delineated based on the outcomes of the grant and identified funds that will be used to support the services, resources, staff and programmatic components of the grant. The grant did not identify funds that will be used for one-time investments rather than on-going costs. The budget details was solid with good supporting documentation.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)

10

0

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The grant did not include any comments/statements on how this project will be sustained after the funding period. The proposal identified four areas that will be expanded, but did not discuss how the different services, programs and resources will be maintained after the term of the grant. The grant discussed the expansion of some current programs and the possibility in using a AVID to reduce achievement gaps at the secondary level but no mention was made on the continuation of these goals after the grant has been completed.

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0

## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The grant did describe the process to create learning environments that will significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students. The issue is on how the grant lacked specificity and how it will implement professional development with fidelity.

Total	210	117
-------	-----	-----



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0954FL-3 for District School Board of Pasco County

## A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district provides detailed plans for setting out its vision in each of the four core educational assurance areas. Each area

has a separate high-quality plan, including goals, activities, timelines, deliverable, and responsible parties.

These plans do demonstrate a clear and credible approach related to the Vision goals.

Overall in Section A(1), this places the DSBPC in the high range of scoring for this component.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)

10

10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district intends to include all students and all schools in its proposal, as all are eligible.

Overall in Section A(2), this places the DSBPC in the high range of scoring for this component.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)

10

10

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The district, through its work tables, outlines an extensive high-quality plan for scaling up its initiatives in order to reach its outcome goals. The work tables include all aspects of a high quality plan, including goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

Overall in Section A(3), this places the DSBPC in the high range of scoring for this component.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

10

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The district clearly describes the goals for each of the required four criteria in its application. These goals do appear to be ambitious and achievable. The methodology is described for determining the methodology for determining growth.

Overall in Section A(4), this places the DSBPC in the high range of scoring for this component.

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	7
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district cites its long-term work with Ridgewood HS as an example of improving student learning outcomes. Although several innovative instructional changes were put in place, the proposal does not cite any changes in student performance at Ridgewood HS.</p> <p>The example of similar intervention with two low-performing elementary schools does cite data evidence of improved student performance.</p> <p>The district did not address the third component of this section, making student performance data available to students, educators, and parents.</p> <p>Overall in Section B(1), this places the DSBPC in the middle range of scoring for this component.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district already has a number of venues in use to make expenditure data available to the public. However, it appears that the dissemination of information about personnel salaries will be a future activity, not a current one, and therefore doesn't demonstrate evidence of current practice.</p>		

Overall in Section B(2), this places the DSBPC in the middle range of scoring for this component.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
---	----	----

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The district cites several examples of its ability to go above and beyond state mandates and use autonomy to implement personalized learning environments. Examples include: differentiated career paths and roles within the teaching profession, use of AVID and IB programs on sites, the opening of a virtual Pasco eschool, and the development of high school career paths.

Overall in Section B(3), this places the DSBPC in the high range of scoring for this component.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	2
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

While the district includes letters of support from a wide variety of stakeholder groups, it does not describe meaningful stakeholder involvement in the development of its proposal, nor in its review or revision.

There is no mention of collaboration with parents, teachers or teachers' representatives, nor is there evidence of support from the teachers' association or 70% of the teachers.

Overall in Section B(4), this places the DSBPC in the low range of scoring for this component.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The district cites several specific examples of gaps in its current status in implementing personalized learning environments, as well as its preliminary plans to address those gaps. The district already has in place a system of monitoring through its Multi-Tiered System of Supports.

Overall in Section B(5), this places the DSBPC in the high range of scoring for this component.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	20

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district's plan for Personalized Learning Environments is extensive and well-thought out. Specific plan details are outlined in the Work Tables in the Appendices, although the present section also describes plans for reconceptualizing secondary schooling and integrating CCS standards through revamped teaching strategies. All of the work is seen through the infrastructure of assessment systems, professional development systems, data systems, and methods of instructional inquiry.

The personalized approach cited by DSBPC includes regular monitoring, increased use and tailoring of guidance services, Each student will be assigned a guidance counselor and a learning coach. The proposal also provides a great deal of differentiation in student settings for learning, times for learning, and approaches to learning. Students will have the capability of co-designing and monitoring their academic pathways through the Educational Learning Profile.

The expectations for rigor in both academic content and use of technology will be monitored continuously.

Overall in Section C(1), this places the DSBPC in the high range of scoring for this component.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	18
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Again, all of the required components of the district's plan for Teaching and Leading are contained in the Work Tables in the Appendices, but the narrative of this section also provides many specifics about the plan. The district proposes an

instructional coach/mentor in each school for the purposes of site-based professional development. The professional development is designed in a differentiated manner as well, with teachers completing a cycle of training and coaching according to their own needs and strengths.

Educators can extend and expand this preparation through the use of the Local Instructional Improvement System and accompanying Learning Management System to gain information on student achievement/needs and to access instructional resources to address those needs.

The district has been part of the Florida RRTT grant, receiving funds for teacher incentives and retention, tied to the teacher and principal evaluation systems. One of their aims is to identify and match highly effective teachers and principals with schools of high need.

Overall in Section C(2), this places the DSBPC in the high range of scoring for this component.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	15
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: The district is already reorganized to some extent for its collaboration with the state's RTTT grant. It will expand that reorganization with the funding of a district grant. The district cites Ridgewood HS as an example of the development and use of school leadership teams. The work charts in the Appendices provide additional information as to how the district wil scale up this model of strong-functioning site leadership teams. The district has in place some existing alternate ways of earning credit/demonstrating mastery. For example, the Learning Management System helps student and their families access current status of credits. They have credit recovery opportunities through APEX and course selection opportunities through the Florida Virtual School and Pasco eSchool. They can also earn credit though the computer-based state EOC exams. Again, the work charts in the Appendices provide more detail as to how these and other oportunities will be ramped up for all students. Through several cited technology resources, students will have the ability to choose multiple ways of demonstrating mastery on core content. The district is investing in specific materials for ELL students, including individual licenses for them to use the Imagine Learning materials, in alignment with the district/state's Title III initiatives. Overall in Section D(1), this places the DSBPC in the high range of scoring for this component.		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: The district's proposal makes clear that it has thought through equity issues in providing access to the learning resources needed by all students. The Pasco Local Instructional Improvement System makes it possible for varied stakeholders to use portals designed specifically for them. Support for the use of the LIIS will be available through a variety of means including an online knowledge database linked from the main district website, podcasts posted on YouTube and accessible through the website and the district's Facebook page. The information from the LIIS will be formattable in other electronic systems, and the design of all these systems meet interoperable data systems requirements in this application. Overall in Section D(2), this places the DSBPC in the high range of scoring for this component.		

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		



The district has thought through a 17-point to-do-list for implementing its high-quality plan (Section D), using a continuous improvement strategy. The first eight points are related to the development of technological access, Extended Learning Plans, and communication issues. These would have benefitted from a little more elaboration. The last 9 points contribute additional performance measures for students, in addition to those in the charts.

In Section E(1), the DSBPC scores in the high range.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district's proposal did not directly address strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.

In Section E(2), the DSBPC scores in the low range.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The first two required performance measures for all students are provided appropriately (in the effective teacher category) for the ALL students group in the charts. The remainder of the charts leave space for subgroups but do not name them or provide any data to be able to determine whether the goals will be ambitious or not. The district has added a performance goal for an increase in the NGA graduation rate, and has clearly labeled the chart with data and appropriate groups.

The first Pre-k through Grade 3 performance measure chart includes a literacy and social/emotional performance measure for pre-school only. The subgroups listed are for Pre-K 3 yr olds and 4 yr olds, not by ESEA subgroup. The second chart for Pre-K through Grade 3 does include first and second graders in the literacy performance measure, and all PK-3 students in the social/emotional performance measure. The social/emotional measure will be measured by teacher evaluation data, and so it is difficult to determine whether the goal is ambitious. No ESEA subgroups are listed.

For grades 4-8, there is not a chart describing a performance measure related to an on-track indicator. The chart reflecting the district's choice of performance measures for grades 4-8 repeats the same measures as the Pre-K through 3. Therefore, the same concerns should be noted.

The first two grades 9-12 charts include grades 6-12. No data are available yet for the FAFSA performance measure, and no ESEA subgroups are listed. For the on-time indicator, no ESEA subgroups are listed and the on-time indicator is not identified. The chart reflecting the district's choice of performance measures for grades 9-12 repeats the same measures as the Pre-K through 3 and grades 4-8. Therefore, the same concerns should be noted. The district does add another measure, the Plan C test (a measure of college and career readiness), and appropriate data and subgroups are listed.

In Section E(3), the DSBPC scores in the middle range.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The information for this section is found at the beginning of the district's proposal in the E section.

In Section E(4), the DSBPC scores in the high range.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district's budget, including the budget narrative and tables, clearly outline a budget based on the district's four priorities first presented in its Vision section, and highlighted throughout the district's high quality plans for implementation. Budget outlays appear to be reasonable and sufficient, and there is clear distinction between ongoing expenditures and one-time expenditures. The district includes \$10,000,000 from other sources over the period of the grant.

The budget project plans are clearly aligned with the high-quality plans presented in earlier sections.

In Section F(1), the DSBPC scores in the high range.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)

10

0

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district does not include a high-quality plan for sustainability.

In Section F(2), the DSBPC scores in the low range.

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: The district did not submit Competitive Preference information		

## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: Throughout its proposal, Pasco County has held firm to its four underlying principles for personalized learning environments, and has designed all of its plans and initiatives around those principles. The work charts in the Appendices provide clear and ambitious efforts to be conducted by the district. The plans include goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. Budget materials are aligned with the four principles and demonstrate an integrated pattern of design. The proposal is both coherent and comprehensive.  The DSBPC has met the Absolute Priority for Personalized Learning Environments.		

Total	210	160
-------	-----	-----



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0954FL-4 for District School Board of Pasco County

## A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score

(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In this section, the applicant sets forth a compelling and coherent reform vision, to create a community which works together so all Pasco County students will reach their highest potential, supported by thorough and detailed plans for doing so. Citing its building blocks for reform as continuous learning, continuity of care, equity, excellence, and innovation, the applicant aims to also build upon its extensive Florida Race to the Top work (which includes details on all four core educational assurance areas) by addressing in this proposal improving differentiation, the use of data, and instructional changes as a result of Common Core State Standards (CCSS).</p> <p>Also through RTT-FL, the district has focused and continues to focus on systemic changes, capacity-building, and infrastructure to improve student achievement - and now aims to enhance this work through establishing Personalized Learning Environments (PLE's) to "redefine the concept of educating students." The applicant envisions students exercising more agency in their learning and teachers transitioning to being facilitators of student learning, with students in a self-directed course of study in which they can demonstrate mastery of CCSS through multiple means of assessments and advance at their own rates through the content.</p> <p>The four overarching goals for creating PLE's that the applicant seeks to accomplish through this proposal are establishing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Robust assessment system,</li> <li>2. Professional development system,</li> <li>3. Data infrastructure system, and</li> <li>4. Practices of inquiry.</li> </ol> <p>While the applicant speaks to equity and excellence several times throughout this section, it does not provide detail regarding <i>how</i> equity and access to high-quality PLE opportunities and effective/highly effective teachers and leaders will be consistently provided across all of its schools, nor <i>how</i> excellence in content and student learning will be ensured. It does, however, set out measures for its vision in this section, and refers to the appendices, in which the applicant provides impressively detailed work tables for its four goals.</p> <p>The applicant's approach to accomplishing this vision clearly and credibly centers on accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests. As a result, the applicant scores in the highest point range for this sub-criterion.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant aims to serve all of its 67,700 students across all content areas through this proposal, and therefore has no process to select schools, grade bands, or subject areas. Details regarding the number of students served, the number and percentage of those who are low-income, and the number of educators in the district are provided in a table.</p> <p>This section lacks a short narrative describing its approach to implementing its reform vision and how its approach will support high-quality LEA-level implementation of its vision, although that is briefly described in the preceding section. Also missing is a number and percentage of "high-need" students; its box simply reads "#." The applicant also does not list in this section a breakdown of all of the schools (even if they are <i>all schools</i>) served by this proposal, and the numeric indicators of each school.</p> <p>While it could be improved with more supporting data (as noted above), the applicant puts forth sufficient detail here and elsewhere in its narrative to merit a score in the high end of the middle point range for this section.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide any information for this section, and instead transitions direction from (A)(2) to (A)(4). However, because the applicant has elsewhere described that this proposal is already aimed at district-wide change, this sub-criterion is predominantly non-applicable to the applicant. Nonetheless, the applicant lacks in this section a clearly articulated, specific, research- or practice-based theory of change on <i>how</i> it will improve student learning outcomes through this proposal.</p>		

As a result, the applicant scores in the high end of the middle point range for this sub-criterion.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

While the applicant provides a detailed table that includes baseline data (sometimes even for two years), projected targets for the life of the grant, and projected targets for two years beyond the grant period, it does not provide a narrative that described how any of these targets were established, and whether they are equal to or exceed the state's ESEA goals for the LEA.

(a) The applicant clearly details which summative assessments are used and when, as well its methodology for determining status and growth. Its target goals for performance (overall, e.g.: from 59% to 83% in reading, 55% to 82% in math) seem clearly considered, reasonable, and appropriately ambitious.

(b) The applicant accurately measures its achievement gaps across subcategories, and sets appropriately ambitious and achievable targets to close them. The degree of gap closure varies from subgroup to subgroups (e.g.: reading gap will close by 10% for ELL students, and by 12% for SWD), which implies reasoned consideration behind setting these targets.

(c) Again, the applicant puts forth reasonable, appropriately ambitious goals for improving its graduation rates.

(d) Earlier in the proposal, the applicant set the goal that, through this grant, 95% of students would complete the FAFSA - yet in this section sets a moderately small gain in postsecondary enrollment rates, from 63% to 69%. While this may be achievable, it does not seem appropriately ambitious, nor aligned with its FAFSA goal.

(e) N/A

Overall, the applicant puts forth strong student learning, performance, and equity goals for this proposal, and therefore scores in the high range of available points.

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	7

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant fails to provide sufficient, detailed evidence that it has a clear record of success over the past four years. It does, however, put forth some examples of improvement.

(a) While the applicant states that its graduation rate has risen (from 67.8% to 85.5%), it does not state the time period over which this improvement occurred. Similarly, the applicant describes a 6% increase of students scoring a 3 or higher in AP exams, but does not state over which time period, the number of students taking these exams, nor which students are taking this exam (i.e., there could be a sampling bias underlying this improvement). It provides no other data on student learning outcomes in this section.

(b) The applicant describes its Title I SIG efforts to improve low-achieving schools, including increasing access to credit-bearing courses, providing staff with additional professional development and planning time, performance pay, and changing start/end times for schools. It does not provide any data regarding the specific student outcomes from this work. The applicant also mentions two low-performance schools that it restructured in 2008-2009, and provides a copy of the restructuring MOU between the board and the union. It omits any evidence of improvement for one of the two schools, and states that the other school improved from a school grade of D to a B four years later. It does not describe the factors and data that are considered in school grades.

(c) The applicant makes no mention of making student performance data available to stakeholders.

Because of this, the applicant scores in the middle range of available points for this section.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant assures that it will make information about school-level expenditures available for of the required (a) through (d) categories. It will do so through district and school websites, the parent/student data portal, the district's Facebook page (an unusual venue for such data), and at each school.

The district has a transparent budget process, inviting public review and holding public forums. The applicant states that for the past four years of budget reductions, the district sought wide stakeholder input and formed committees (comprised of whom is unclear) to review stakeholder suggestions.

While this section is brief, the applicant meets the requirements of this sub-criterion and therefore receives all points available.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

7

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Because the applicant is in a RTT state, one can make some assumptions about the district's policy environment and its autonomy/flexibility to successfully support personalized learning environments. The applicant fails to describe the state context for RTT and the autonomy it provides to LEAs.

The applicant lists the following legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements as well as programs and policies in support of PLE's: a teaching salary career ladder program, an *Achievement Via Individual Determination* program, a Career and Professional Education Act, AP and IB courses and curricula, a dual enrollment program, a virtual instruction program, and a graduation enhancement program. While all of these are helpful and well-described programs and policies in and of themselves, the applicant does not unite these context factors into a coherent whole, clearly explaining their connection to implementing PLE's.

As a result, the applicant scores in the high end of the middle range of available points for this section.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes its strong record of stakeholder engagement through over 22,800 approved volunteers logging over 366,000 volunteer hours last year. The district also describes its relationships with the business community and institutes of higher education.

The applicant fails to describe *any* engagement with students, families, teachers, principals, and/or collective bargaining representatives throughout the development process for this proposal.

Six letters of support for this proposal are included in the appendices, including from: the economic development council, the local education foundation, and a local employer.

While the district appears to engage stakeholders in education in general, and to have garnered support for this proposal specifically, the applicant does not describe community and stakeholder engagement in the development of this proposal. As a result, it scores in the middle range of possible points for this section.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

4

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant acknowledges that its schools are in an "emergent level of infusing practices that support PLE's" and aims to lay a foundation of teacher and leader professional development to create and sustain a culture of individualized learning for all students.

Rather than describing needs and gaps for PLE's, the applicant instead describes the overarching - and substantial - *barriers* that will need to be addressed for successful implementation, such as: funding/PD for technology, resistance to culture change in schools, and teachers shifting the instructional practices from experts to facilitators. Many of the barriers, as described, will require innovative and adaptive leadership at all levels in the system, and - while the applicant describes a process for collecting evidence of protocols, practices, and values (through its Multi-Tiered System of Supports) - the applicant does not fully explain its theory of change regarding *how* it will ameliorate the effects of each of the listed barriers.

A list of proposed tools and resources to support PLE's is included that will help in the implementation, but could better link how these resources address needs and gaps.

The logic behind the proposed reform is reasonable, although the needs and gaps analysis could be more substantiated and rigorous. Nonetheless, the applicant scores in the high range of available points for this section.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Overall, the applicant has a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready.</p> <p>(a) The applicant proposes to have all students in the district participate in an engaging and empowering process to exercise more agency over their own learning through Personalized Learning Environments (PLE's) and Educational Learner Profiles (ELP's) - with the support of parents and educators.</p> <p>(i), (ii) - The applicant proposes to have all students be "co-creators" of their own educational plans, in which they articulate learning and life goals, determine how to demonstrate meeting those goals, and measure their progress against them. This plan would therefore connect student learning to success in accomplishing their goals. The applicant does not, however, provide much detail regarding how college- and career-ready standards will be explicitly introduced to and understood by students so that they can plan their learning around meeting these standards accordingly.</p> <p>(iii) In this proposal, students are able to pursue their own interests, but there is no quality assurance process for ensuring that by doing so, they are engaging in deep learning experiences. Students are responsible for monitoring their own progress and accelerating their own learning, which could lead to a wide range of variability in implementation without clear expectations and scaffolding for students to do so. Similarly, the applicant states that students are "afforded the opportunity" to create these deep learning experiences in areas of interest, but mere provision of an opportunity does not ensure that it is actualized.</p> <p>(iv) The applicant states that, through technology, students will have "opportunities for students from diverse communities, cultures, races, and creeds" but provides no detail as to how these opportunities will be implemented consistently for all students to have this access and exposure, nor how multiculturalism will motivate and deepen student learning.</p> <p>(v) The applicant sets forth an admirable model for fostering student responsibility for their own academic content and goal setting. While it may be implied in some of the learning formats, such as project-based learning, the applicant does not explicitly state how skills such as teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving will be developed in students through this proposal.</p> <p>(b)</p> <p>(i) Through the ELP's the applicant proposes a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development from 6th through 12th grade designed to enable students to achieve their individual learning goals, aligned with college-/career-ready standards.</p> <p>(ii) The applicant describes a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments available to students through this proposal, but does not speak to how students will both engage in learning through their existing proclivities while also developing new talents across other learning dimensions. Instead, it allows students to "select the path that best meets their needs," implying that students could choose to pursue a single modality of instruction throughout their 6-12 education - which would not help prepare them for the diversity of the world beyond high school.</p> <p>(iii) The applicant will be implementing Common Core State Standards, as well as state and district graduation requirements in this proposal. All content, including an array of digital content opportunities detailed by the applicant, would be aligned with these standards and requirements. The applicant does not provide much detail about the content itself, but rather the means by which it would be taught.</p> <p>(iv) The applicant proposes that all students receive ongoing and regular feedback on their learning, including</p> <p>(A) The applicant states that student progress will be tracked real-time through digital ELP's, allowing readily accessible student data to inform teaching and learning.</p> <p>(B) In this proposal, students would meet quarterly with an assigned guidance counselor to review progress</p>		

towards graduation and discuss recommended college and career opportunities for the students to consider.

Similarly, students would meet "at least once a week" with an assigned "learning coach" to support and scaffold students' learning (i.e.: content, instruction, supports) so that they stay on track with their goals. Both of these proposed activities could be significantly helpful to students - but both also seem to be overly ambitious. The applicant does not provide a student to counselor ratio, but nationwide it averages around 500:1; it may not be realistic for a counselor to meet quarterly with 500 students to discuss and plan their futures. Likewise, the applicant does not provide a ratio of students to "learning coaches" and also does not describe whether these meetings would be individualized or in groups, but meeting at least once a week with students would need to be carefully scheduled and choreographed.

(v) The applicant states that it will provide accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards, provided by individualized and small-group instruction from teachers and "academic coaches" as well as peer support and learning. The applicant also describes additional supports like APEX Learning to help struggling students to keep pace with their learning goals.

However, the applicant also states that it will accommodate students' "desired pace of work" - which could encourage some students (high-need or not) to not challenge themselves to learn at a rate that reflects their full potential.

(c) Through PLE's, teachers, counselors, learning coaches, and technology, the applicant provides evidence of sufficient processes and mechanisms in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning.

The work tables the applicant includes in the appendices are impressively detailed, and help bolster the feasibility and strength of this section and the proposal overall. While it has some small areas in need of further detail or consideration, and it lacks some specificity in the *implementation* of its instructional strategies, the applicant scores in the high range of available points for this section.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

15

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes an approach that helps educators to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards by enabling the full implementation of personalized learning and teaching for all students. No mention, however, is made of leader development in this section.

(a) The applicant outlines extensive training and resources that will build educators' capacity to create PLE's. It is unclear in this proposal how much of this professional development will take place in teams through professional learning communities vs. individually through coaching, though both modalities are discussed in this section.

(i) Through this proposal, educators would receive access to and training in an array of tools, strategies, and resources that would support the effective implementation of PLE's to meet each student's academic needs and help ensure all students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready. Examples include a real-time data system that is linked to appropriate assessments (LIIS), curricula, texts, and other resources that are aligned with Common Core State Standards; and digital platforms for collaboration, blogging, and video conferencing.

(ii) The applicant does not discuss in this section how it would adapt content and instruction to meet students' needs and interests, although it does address this elsewhere in the proposal as well as in the work plans included in the appendices.

(iii) Through their LIIS, the applicant will provide real-time data to be used by teachers to accelerate student learning. Furthermore, the district proposes using a collaborative inquiry approach for teachers to evaluate and continuously improve their individual and collective practice, grounded in the ongoing review of student data.

(iv) While the applicant discusses at length its relatively new (since December 2010) teacher evaluation system, it only does so to explain that those receiving unsatisfactory evaluations for three consecutive years will not be eligible for employment in an instructional capacity, and those performing well will be eligible for pay-for-performance incentives. It does not speak to if and how feedback is provided and used in evaluation systems, how it provides support for teachers in need of improvement, and it makes no mention of principal evaluations whatsoever.

(b) According to the applicant's description of the LIIS and professional development coaches in each school, all participating educators would have access to, and would know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

(i) - (ii) The applicant asserts that this would include actionable data that helps educators identify optimal learning

approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests, as well as high-quality learning resources, including digital resources, that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards, and the tools to create and share new resources electronically across the district.

(iii) While the applicant states that it will provide tools, resources, and approaches matching specific, individual student needs, it does not provide much detail as to how this would take place. It does state that as students access these resources, their progress will help determine how effective the resources are in meeting their needs.

(c) The applicant lacks details regarding school leadership and school leadership teams in this section. It does mention creating a new position (a professional development coach) in each school, but it does not imply that this position has any supervisory or leadership role.

(i) In this section, the applicant describes incentives and performance consequences in teacher evaluation policy, but fails to provide details on how their evaluation system improves individual and collective effectiveness and school culture and climate, for the purpose of continuous school improvement.

(ii) The applicant describes a new position, the professional development coach, for each school in the district. This position will focus on helping teachers learn about and engage in systems and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps.

(d) The applicant provides recruitment and retainment incentives to teachers in five low-performing schools across the district; it is considering providing similar incentives for teachers in historically critical shortage content areas. Its theory of action is that if it provides appropriate incentives and performance consequences, it will increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers. Again, no mention of principals in this section.

Overall, while the applicant fails to provide detail on the leaders' role in this section, it does mention leaders in its work plan in the appendices. It therefore scores in the low end of the high range of possible points for this section.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	13
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant has a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning.</p> <p>(a) The applicant has an existing cross-functional LEA RTT team, which it would expand through this proposal, and which would provide support, strategic planning, and implementation services to all participating schools.</p> <p>(b) The applicant provides an example of how it has exercised school-level flexibility and autonomy through its SIG school, particularly pertaining to factors such as school schedules and calendars. While it does not directly then make clear that it would do the same for this proposal, but that intention is implied. The applicant does not provide evidence of flexibility in school personnel decisions, staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and noneducators, and school-level budgets.</p> <p>(c) The applicant provides extensive evidence that it will empower students to progress through content and earn credits based on mastery rather than seat time, including online learning as well as online End of Course (EOC) exams that can be taken at any time for credit.</p> <p>(d) The applicant states in this section and elsewhere that it will provide students with the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways - including real-time online assessments, alternative projects and product-based assessments, and other alternatives.</p> <p>(e) Through this proposal, the applicant will provide research-based learning resources and instructional practices that incorporate universal design for learning principals for accessibility, and align with IEPs and ELL plans. The applicant lists a number of means of doing so, including a portal through its LIIS for students to engage with resources and curricula, participate in assessments with real-time feedback, upload assignments, and collaborate with other students.</p> <p>While it lacks some detail, the applicant provides sufficient evidence to score in the highest range of possible points for this section.</p>		



(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	9
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide all stakeholders the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.</p> <p>(a) All stakeholders (i.e., students, parents, educators, and others) will have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of the applicant's proposal - however, this access is entirely built on an online platform, and low-income students and families may therefore not have equitable access to these resources.</p> <p>(b) The applicant intends to provide adequate and multiple means of technical support for engaging with resources, such as: in-person trainings, podcasts, YouTube videos, and online resources on both the district website and its Facebook page.</p> <p>(c) &amp; (d) The applicant states that data and resources will be exportable in standard formats for use in downloading to other software, and that all of its data systems will meet the sub-criterion's requirements for interoperability.</p> <p>Other than not accounting for families lacking computers and online access outside of schools, the applicant provided sufficient clarity and detail in this section to score in the high range of possible points.</p>		

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	5
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant did not submit a narrative for this section. In looking elsewhere in the proposal, the applicant provides scant evidence of a continuous improvement process for its overall proposal. It does, however, mention continuous improvement with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Florida's teaching salary career ladder program, through which the applicant piloted a program to develop teacher leadership with an emphasis on continuous improvement; and</li> <li>Proposing to "develop and utilize practices of inquiry to assess targeted elements of the PLE implementation process <i>and to ensure continuous improvement.</i>"</li> </ul> <p>While the applicant includes a work table in the appendices for developing practices of inquiry for continuous improvement, it is narrowly focused on monitoring progress in PLE strategies and outcomes. The applicant lacks clearly specific cycle times for reviewing and analyzing data (other than checking a box indicating project year), a process for incorporating feedback from data into correcting and improving the implementation plan, and a means to publicly share information on the quality of the RTT investment.</p> <p>Because the applicant does not have a strategy for a <i>rigorous</i> continuous improvement process, it scores in the low end of the mid-range of available points for this section.</p> <p>?</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	0
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant did not submit a narrative for this section, and does not provide any strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with both internal and external stakeholder elsewhere in the proposal.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

In this section, the applicant only provides tables with incomplete performance measures (lacking principal data) - and fails to provide any narrative to (a) describe its rationale for selecting measures, (b) explain how the measures will provide information aligned with its proposed plan regarding implementation successes and concerns, and (c) describe how it will review and improve measures over time.

The applicant's performance measures are as follows:

- All: (a) to increase highly effective teachers from 2% to 10%, and (b) to accordingly decrease the effective teachers from 92% to 88%. This implies that currently, 94% of their teachers are effective or highly effective, and 98% will be after the grant - which may be unrealistically ambitious given the inevitable tumult of transitioning to a PLE's and the roll-out of Common Core State Standards, or imply a low bar for quality.
- PreK-3: The applicant proposes decreasing the number of three and four year olds who are below expectations in literacy and social-emotional development by roughly ten percentage points.
- 4-8: (a) The applicant will use the Florida Assessment for Instruction & Reading (FAIR) median percentile rank to measure improvement, and targets exactly a ten percentage point improvement across all grades. This one-size-fits-all improvement target may be realistic, but it is not sufficiently ambitious (e.g.: no final target is above 55%). Furthermore, it is questionable to use the median percentile rank rather than the mean. (b) The applicant does not provide a leading indicator for successful implementation. (c) The applicant's indicator for social-emotional well-being, is ambiguously defined and measured, with no baseline or interim data and an 80% goal for teacher evaluations to reflect this after the grant.
- 9-12: (a) The applicant has not tracked FAFSA data and intends to establish a baseline for it this year and subsequently set targets for completion; this seems to be a reasonable approach for this category given the circumstances. (b) The applicant, through its Early Warning System, intends to increase the percentage of students on track to college/career readiness from 60% to 85% post-grant, or by five percentage points each year. This is an appropriately ambitious and achievable goal. (c) While the applicant names its indicator of career readiness, the C-PLAN test, it fails to contextualize or explain the numbers in the columns for its targets - which could be number of students, percentage of proficient, or any other number. It is therefore impossible to determine whether these are ambitious and achievable. (d) The applicant proposes using its FAIR assessment as an indicator, but again uses median percentiles and low end targets (≤57%) [see 4-8(a), above]. (e) See 408 (c), above - the same target is ambiguously set.

While the applicant has an adequate number of performance measures, not all of them are broken out by subgroup, not all of them are sufficiently ambitious, and some lack data, targets, and/or clarity. Furthermore, the applicant provides no narrative to explain these targets. The applicant therefore scores in the low end of the mid-range of available points for this section.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant proposes to evaluate the effectiveness of its RTT-D activities through a variety of means, such as evaluating its PD through the Florida Professional Development Protocol and hiring outside evaluators to ensure compliance with grant management. It does not speak to any evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of its activities involving technology (e.g.: instruction, assessment, collaboration and networking), community partnerships, compensation reform, or modification of school structures and schedules.		
The applicant outlines a number of helpful benchmarks tied to specific dates in this section, but does not specify how achieving those benchmarks will be evaluated and what will happen if they are not met. Similarly, the applicant fails to specify timelines and processes for regularly reviewing any of its interim outcomes and adjusting and improving its implementation plan.		
Overall, the applicant presents an inadequate overview of how it would evaluate the effectiveness of its investments, and scores in the middle range of available points for this section.		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The applicant's budget identifies the funds that will support the project, namely, the requested RTT-D award funding and an additional \$14,000,000 from "capital outlay" to develop their assessment and student information system platform.

(b) The budget in years 2 through 4 seems reasonable, but year 1 is odd: it only lists \$10,000 for personnel, yet has fringe benefits at \$392,598. This discrepancy could indicate an error in either direction - that the personnel needs to substantially increased, or the fringe substantially decreased. If the personnel costs are indeed only \$10,000 in year one, then the applicant would not have a strong start to the proposal and would waste time and money in year 1 if it is getting it up off the ground in later years.

(c) (i) and (ii) The applicant's budget narrative speaks to its four broad goal areas. It also provides a table in which it describes how line item expenditures will be used, and ties each to one or more of the goal areas. While this is a useful table, it does not provide totals in the overarching categories to compare to the project budget, nor does it break out expenditures by project year. It is also awkward to readily identify which expenditures are one-time, and which are ongoing.

The applicant provides a reasonably sufficient overview of its budget and - with the exception of the anomaly in year 1 personnel - it seems to be adequately scoped for the proposed project. The applicant therefore scores in the highest range of points available for this section.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)

10

4

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant fails to provide a specific narrative or proposed budget for sustainability for section (F)(2). It does, however, describe its four broad goal areas (robust assessment system, increase capacity of teachers/leaders, interactive data infrastructure system, and inquiry/continuous improvement), from which one can infer sustainability through a deep focus on building infrastructures and systems across the district that will outlive the life of the proposed project.

The applicant is therefore awarded *some* points for this section, placing it in the middle range of available points.

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: N/A		

## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: The applicant presents a coherent and comprehensive approach to creating PLE's, using its existing RTT-FL work as a foundation upon which to build. While it lacks clarity and details in some places, all in all this is a solid concept that meets the Absolute Priority 1.		

Total	210	133
-------	-----	-----

